UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/672,142	09/27/2000	Craig A. Nies	5076	6191

7590   07/28/2004

GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 Edison Way, Suite L
Menlo Park, CA 94025

EXAMINER
BOOKER, KELVIN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2121	

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Best Available Copy

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _26 April 2004_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-40_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _28-33,35,36 and 38-40_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) _34_ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1,2,6-9 and 37_ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _3-5 and 10-27_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _27 September 2000_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Best Available Copy

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☒ Other: _Detailed Office Action_.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. **Claims 1, 2, 6-9 and 37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yancher

et al. [hereafter Yancher], "Visualization of Modeling Results in Database Marketing".

As per claim 1, Yancher teaches of a computer implemented system for analyzing results

of a predictive model applied to data pertaining to a plurality of entities, the method comprising:

A. a predictive model that scores the entities and provides a rank ordered listing of at

least some of the entities, and at least one reason for each listed entity (see page 2, section *Model*

guided data visualization: Cumulative Gains-Charts); and

B. for each reason, a report tree hyperlinked to the reason and containing a plurality of

hyperlinked reports, including at least one summary level report providing a summary of data

contributing to the reason the entity is included in the rank ordered listing (see page 3, section

Model guided data visualization: Tree Viewing).

As per claim 2, Yancher teaches of a computer implemented method of analyzing results

of a predictive model applied to a data pertaining to a plurality of entities, the method

comprising:

A. providing a predictive model for scoring the entities (see page 2, section *Model guided data visualization*;

B. displaying a rank ordering at least some of the entities according to their scores (see page 2, section *Model guided data visualization: Cumulative Gains-Charts*); and

C. for each of the displayed entities, providing a hyperlink to a report tree containing a plurality of hyperlinked reports, including at least one summary report providing a quantitative summary of data contributing to a reason the entity is included in the rank ordered listing (see page 3, section *Model guided data visualization: Tree Viewing*).

As per claim 6, Yancher teaches of a method wherein the predictive model is for identifying suspicious entities based on transactions associated with the entities (see page 1, section *Problem domain*; page 2, section *Model guided data visualization*; and pages 3-4, section *Visualization of target segments identified by a model*).

As per claim 7, Yancher teaches of a method wherein the entities include at least one entity that is derived from multiple entities that interact with each other (see page 4, section *Visualization of target segments identified by a model: "Target Area Cubes" (TAC) approach)*.

As per claim 8, Yancher teaches of a method wherein a reason for including an entity in the rank ordered listing is suspicious activity of the entity, and the report tree includes a summary report providing a summary of activity of the entity (see page 2, section *Model guided data visualization*; and pages 3-4, section *Visualization of target segments identified by a model*).

As per claim 9, Yancher teaches of a method wherein an entity is included in the rank ordered listing if the entity's activities are suspicious relative to the activities of the entity's peers (see pages 3-4, section *Visualization of target segments identified by a model*).

As per claim 37, Yancher teaches of a system for analyzing activities of entities, the

system comprising:

A. a data source including activity data for a plurality of entities (see page 1, section

Problem domain);

B. a predictive model communicatively coupled to the data source that executes on the

activity data, and generates an ordered list of suspect entities, the ordered list of entities selected

based on their predictive model scores (see page 2, section *Model guided data visualization:*

Cumulative Gains-Charts); and

C. a report tree containing a hierarchy of predetermined reports, each report hyperlinked

to at least one other report, and containing at least one summary report of a selected entity's

activity in a selected time period, a report applied to selected activity data of the selected entity

in response to the report being accessed in the report tree (see page 3, section *Model guided data*

visualization: Tree Viewing).

Allowable Subject Matter

3.   **Claim 34** is allowed.

4.   **Claims 3, 4, 5 and 10-27** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base

claim and any intervening claims.

5.   The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

the cited prior art fails to explicitly teach of a method for analyzing the results of a

predictive model wherein a report tree contains a plurality of reports which fine-tune determined

suspicious activities by further categorizing, defining and breaking-down tree reports respective

of an entity's determined activity.

Conclusion

6. The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure:

   A. Pham et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,970,482;

   B. Phillips et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,473,084;

   C. Jennings et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,606,615;

   D. Wagstaff et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,629,095;

   E. Califano, U.S. Patent No. 5,577,249;

   F. Beller, U.S. Patent No. 5,852,819;

   G. Noguchi, U.S. Patent No. 5,873,082;

   H. Cook, U.S. Patent No. 5,895,453;

   I. Gehrke et al., "Classification and regression: money *can* grow on trees";

   J. Khoshgoftaar et al., "Predicting the Order of Fault-Prone Modules in Legacy

Software"; and

   K. Stokes et al., "Recent Enhancements and New Directions in SAS/STAT Software,

Part 1: Updates".

7. An inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Kelvin Booker whose telephone number is (703) 308-4088. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM-5:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Anthony Knight, can be reached on (703) 308-3179. The fax number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

An inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

K.E.B.

Art Unit 2121

July 26, 2004

RAMESH PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
For Anthony Knight.